

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/043,241	BRATZ ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Sabiha N. Qazi	1616	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Sabiha N. Qazi. (3) _____.

(2) Jason Voight. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 15 April 2004.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: all pending claims.

Identification of prior art discussed: _____.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Examiner spoke to Attorney Voight about defective appeal brief. The rejection under 101 double Patenting was not addressed. When claims are rejected under 101 DP, the brief and arguments over the same claims cannot be argued. Any disclaimer will not be acceptable under this situation. The brief is defective. Mr. Voight said applicant will withdraw the Patent 6,482,772. He will call back for further discussion if necessary, he may consider filing an RCE. Previous communication was an error as papers were filed on time therefore rejection will be withdrawn. . .